

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.ampto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 10/088,392 08/26/2002 Ingo Beckmann VO-564 5154 05/12/2003 Pauley Petersen EXAMINER Kinne & Erickson EICKHOLT, EUGENE H Suite 365 2800 West Higgins Road ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER Hoffman Estates, IL 60195 2854

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A''B'	
<i>)</i> `	t'	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/088,392	BECKMANN ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Eugene H Eickholt	2854	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ad patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONF	nety filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.	
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 h	March 2002 .		
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.		
` 3)□				
Disposit	closed in accordance with the practice under a ion of Claims	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.		
	on Papers			
	The specification is objected to by the Examiner			
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accep			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.				
11)[]	If approved, corrected drawings are required in rep		ved by the Examiner.	
12) 🗌 🗆	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa			
	nder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f)	
	☑ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	p	(4) 01 (1).	
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents	have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents		n No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.				
 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 				
15) [] A	cknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic	risional application has been rece priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 a	ived. and/or 121.	
Attachment	(s)			
) 🔲 Notice	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) eation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> .		(PTO-413) Paper No(s) atent Application (PTO-152)	

Art Unit: 2854

. 5

The references cited in the Search Report PCT/EP 00/08043 have been considered, but will not be listed on any patent resulting from this application because they were not provided on a separate list in compliance with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(1). In order to have the references printed on such resulting patent, a separate listing, preferably on a PTO-1449 form, must be filed within the set period for reply to this Office action.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim is not understandable as the last 3 lines fail to recite a method of printing step and should be reworded such as:

"setting a defined ratio in a color printing method between one group of fluorescent pigments of print colors yellow, blue (cyan) and red (magenta) and special color tones and a second group of non-fluorescent pigments of the print colors".

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States. Claim 1 is so far as understandable rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ludlum.

Application/Control Number: 10/088,392 Page 3

Art Unit: 2854

).

Column 2, line 49-50, teach the primary colors and additional blends of colors which reads on the fluorescent pigments and special color tones.

Column 1, lines 55-59, read on the mixture of fluorescent pigments, shades of color and non-fluorescent colorants. Preselection of relative proportions reads on the setting a defined ratio step. Column 4, lines 37-43 identify use of pigments of both fluorescent and non-flour scent properties.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ludlum et al.

Ludlum et al gives a generalized teaching of using preselected relative proportions. It would have been an obvious matter of routine experimentation to one of ordinary skill in the highly complex field of chemical ink compositions to have arrived at the broad ratios set forth in dependent claims 2-6.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

ï

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or non-obviousness.

No objective evidence is presented in the specification indicating a new or unexpected result. No teaching away from the claimed ratios is presented in the prior art.. No impartial expert affidavits are presented directed to the ratios recited as being unobvious.

In Ludlum et al the daylight fluorescent colorants referred to in column 3, lines 55-68 and column 4, lines 1-3, either alone or in combination with "visible light colorants read on the "vertically active substances of claims 2-6.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schoen et al.

Schoen et al discloses in paragraph number 0015 the use of special effect pigments, fluorescent pigments and organic color pigments as a printing ink. Paragraph number 0022 indicates all known printing techniques may be employed to print such a composite ink. Paragraph number 0029 teaches use in valuable graphic products, advertising, etc. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the printing art, highly complex art to have used the primary color pigments and color tone variations to produce multi-color printing on such products as described

Art Unit: 2854

in paragraph 2. The special effect pigments reads on the "optically active substances" of claims 2-6.

Regarding claim 2-6, exact proportions or ratios are not specified by Schoen. However, one of ordinary skill may be expected to engage in routine experimentation to select the ratios or proportions of the fluorescent pigments and organic color pigment (non-fluorescent pigments and special affect substances (optically active).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or non-obviousness.

No objective evidence is presented in the specification indicating a new or unexpected result is presented. Note paragraph number 0022 of Shoen et al uses conventional printing techniques as does applicant at page 4 of the specification. It would appear an obvious matter of design choice is present in the ratios to be selected in Schoen et al.

Art Unit: 2854

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

A shortened statutory period of 3 months is set to respond.

E EICKHOLT/pj

05/06/03

EUGENE H. EICKHOLT PRIMARY EXAMINER This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Any inquiry concerning the specifics of this communication should be directed to Examiner Eickholt, who can be reached Tuesday through Thursday. Inquiries of a general nature should be directed to the TC2800 receptionist.

Contact numbers:

Exr. Eugene Eickholt SPE Andrew Hirshfeld TC 2800 Receptionist

TC 2800 Reception TC 2800 Fax

703-308-0125

703-305-6619 703-308-0956

703-308-7722 703-305-3432

703-308-7724

EUGENE H. EICKHOLT PRIMARY EXAMINER

Graphett Eichholt

BEST AVAILABLE COPY